WITNES	S	Brown, Vic												
DEPOSI	ION	7/8/2020												
			AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS							pleteness Designation				REPLY DESIGNATIONS * Pink = Completeness Designation
	Page/Li	Objections	Replies to Objections			e/Li De End No	esignation	Objections	Objection Notes	Replies to Objections			Objections	Replies to Objections
ne Begii	ne End	5	n/a	<i>пе веді</i> 12	9 12	2 12	otes	Relavance	Notes	Plaintiffs designated testimony specifically	46 19	ne End	4	n/a
	1 1				1 -					relating to Brown's time with the Kentucky State				
										Police (see, e.g., 15:11-16:1). This is relevant to				
_	$\perp \perp$									provide context for that testimony.				
11	2 11	7	n/a	12 1	19 13	3 10		Relavance		Plaintiffs designated testimony specifically	193 14	193 1	5	n/a
										relating to Brown's time with the Kentucky State Police (see, e.g., 15:11-16:1). This is relevant to				
										provide context for that testimony.				
15 1	1 16	1 Relevance-	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in	14 1	10 14	1 15		Relavance	Brown is	Plaintiffs designated testimony specifically	234	234 17	7	n/a
		geographic	trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the						representing	relating to Brown's time with the Kentucky State				
		scope; relevance; vague	Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and						AHIDTA not KY State Police	Police (see, e.g., 15:11-16:1). This is relevant to provide context for that testimony.				
		vague	interest under regarding local opious issues. The Application Interest in Interest of Committee and						State Folice	provide context for that testimony.				
			County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably											
			connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value											
			through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington.											
			Here, Defendants' specific inquiry into the AHIDTA Director's personal knowledge of when prescription opioids were prevalent in the region											
			provides factual regional context regarding opioid diversion that reasonably supports the factfinder's understanding of the development of the											
			opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington.											
			Objection for vagueness by Defendants to Defendants' own question is not supported. First, clarity could have been achieved by the examiner at											
			the time through a rephrasing of the question. Second, the concern for the clarity of the wording has been demonstrably avoided by the witness' clear response that, "The late '90s was when it became a very prevalent problem in eastern Kentucky with diversion and consumption of opioids											
			and prescription medications."											
16 1	7 16 2	4 Relevance-	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in	15	2 15	10					255 1	255 16	6 Duplicative	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable
10 1	10 2	geographic	trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the	13	2 13	10					233	255 10	designation;	connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter
			Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and										already fully	of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia
			sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and										covered by	High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and
			federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA										Plaintiffs'	provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA
			County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value										Defendants'	mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County
			through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington.										completeness	is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region.
														Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the
			Here, Defendants' specific inquiry into the AHIDTA Director's personal knowledge of when prescription opioids were prevalent in the region										Relevance-	opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with
			provides factual regional context regarding opioid diversion that reasonably supports the factfinder's understanding of the development of the										geographic	value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid
			opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington.										scope; foundation	epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington.
													loundation	Here, Defendants' specific inquiry into the AHIDTA Director's personal knowledge of when
														prescription opioids were migrating into the region provides factual regional context regarding opioid
														diversion that reasonably supports the factfinder's understanding of the development of the opioid
		1												epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington.
														Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the testimony itself. Moreover,
														the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's
														knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in
		1												the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enforcement. Finally,
														the witness was capable of answering, as shown by the testimony herein and throughout.
		1												

WITNI DEPO:		Brown, Vic 7/8/2020	3											
			AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS				COUNTER	DESIGNATION	VS * Pink = Com	ppleteness Designation				REPLY DESIGNATIONS * Pink = Completeness Designation
	i Page, in ne En		Replies to Objections						Objection Notes	Replies to Objections		Page/Li ne End	Objections	Replies to Objections
		14 Relevance- geographic scope; relevanc vague; no answer designated	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the examples of the policy of the	17	1 177	7 10	0	Relevance	Representing AHIDTA not KY	Plaintiffs designated testimony specifically relating to Brown's time with the Kentucky State Police (see, e.g., 15:11-16:1). This is relevant to provide context for that testimony.			8 Duplicative designation; 261:4-262:15 already covered by Plaintiffs' affirmatives and Defendants completeness. Relevance-geographic scope; foundation	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, Defendants' specific inquiry into the AHIDTA Director's personal knowledge of when the rise of prescription medication abuse, how and where doctor shopping became a focus of law enforcement, and how diversion occurs "on the streets" are all facts that provide factual regional context regarding opioid diversion that reasonably supports the factfinder's understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the testimony and Exhibit 5 itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enforcement. Finally, the witness was capable of
18	17 18	24 Relevance- geographic scope; relevand vague	See above.	21 2	223 223	2 18	8	Relavance	Representing AHIDTA not KY State Police	Plaintiffs designated testimony specifically relating to Brown's time with the Kentucky State Police (see, e.g., 15:11-16:1). This is relevant to provide context for that testimony.	263 1	9 264 2	Duplicative designation; 264:10-24 already covered by Plaintiffs' affirmatives. Relevance-geographic scope; foundation [Objections applicable to 263:19-264:9]	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WH IDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, Defendants' specific inquiry into the AHIDTA Director's personal recollection of the deposition testimony and any link between prescription medications and heroin provides context to the development of testimony regarding prescription medications frequently diverted in the region. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enforcement. Finally, the witness was capable of answering, as shown by the testimony herein and throughout.
20	5 20	18 Relevance- geographic scope; relevance vague; no question designated	See above.	33 1	18 34	4 6	6	Form		Form objection not preserved by contemporanous objection; Plaintiffs do not identify with particularity the form that they allege is objectionable.				
21	13 21	22 Relevance; foundation	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the facts that the AHIDTA Director understood the prescription opioid use became a problem in Huntington and Cabell County and has been ongoing for years provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enforcement. Finally, the witness was capable of answering, as shown by the testimony herein and throughout.	34 1	13 35	5 21		Relevance, scope	distribution by defendants is outside of scope of his knowledge of	Testimony is responsive to multiple 30(b)(6) topics (e.g. , Topics 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15). To the extent testimony falls outside of designated 30(b)(6) topics, it is admissible as provided in Mr. Brown's personal capacity. See, e.g., Falchenberg v. New York State Dep't of Educ., 642 F. Supp. 2d 156, 164 (S.D.N.Y. 2008), off'd, 338 F. App'x 11 (2d Cir. 2009) ("Questions and answers exceeding the scope of the 30(b)(6) notice will not bind the corporation, but are merely treated as the answers of the individual deponent.").				

WITNESS DEPOSITIO	N	Brown, Vic 7/8/2020													
			AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS				COUNTE	R DESIGNATION	VS * Pink = Cor	npleteness Designation					REPLY DESIGNATIONS * Pink = Completeness Designation
Page/Li F		Objections	Replies to Objections	Page/Li	Page	e/Li Des	esignation	Objections	Objection	Replies to Objections	Page/L	Li Pag	ge/Li	Objections	Replies to Objections
62 18		Relevance- geographic scope; relevance; foundation; expert opinion	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic, in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, Defendants' specific inquiry into AHIDTA threats and historical changes addressed by AHIDTA reasonably supports the factfinder's understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic, namely the transition from prescription opioids to synthetic opioids and the drug market developments in and around Cabell and Huntington. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enf	ne Begin 38 5	1 n e Ei	End Noi	otes		Notes		ne Beg	ne e	End		
		Foundation; vague	Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enforcement. Finally, the witness was capable of answering, as shown by the testimony herein and throughout. Objection for vagueness by Defendants to Defendants' own question is not supported. First, the question is a yes or no question answered twice with an affirmative "yes" and supported with explanations. Second, the concern for the clarity of the wording has been demonstrably avoided by the witness' clear response that he unequivocally believes that Cabell County and the City of Huntington are facing a drug crisis today.	42 16											
76 5		Foundation; vague	Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enforcement. Finally, the witness was capable of answering, as shown by the testimony herein and throughout. Objection for vagueness by Defendants to Defendants' own question is not supported. First, clarity could have been achieved by the examiner at the time through a rephrasing of the question. Second, the concern for the clarity of the wording has been demonstrably avoided by the witness' clear response that, "opioids became more prevalent in the late '90s through the early 2000s, and still exists today. More in the synthetic form now than in the legal form." Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in	38 15											
01 24	0	geographic	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to snow a ract or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, Defendants' specific inquiry into AHIDTA threats and historical changes addressed by AHIDTA reasonably supports the factfinder's understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in and around Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enforcement. Finally, the witness was capable of answering, as shown by the testimony herein and throughout.	30 13	J 36	, 1/									

WITNES		Brown, Vic 7/8/2020										
			AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS			COUNTE	R DESIGNATION	NS * Pink = Con	npleteness Designation			REPLY DESIGNATIONS * Pink = Completeness Designation
	Page/Li	Objections				Li Designation	Objections	Objection	Replies to Objections		i Objections	Replies to Objections
	ne End	8 Relevance- geographic scope; foundation				d Notes		Notes		in ne End		
251 2	0 252	8 Relevance- geographic scope; foundation	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WY HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, facts regarding the regional increase in the number of opioids being diverted and that, of the classes of prescription drugs, the most commonly diverted was opioids and the length of that fact reasonably support the factfinder's understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in and around Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enforcement. Finally, the witness was capable of answering, as shown by the testimony herein and throughout.	40 11	40	14						
253 1	9 254	8 Relevance- geographic scope; foundation	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, facts regarding the regional increase in the number of opioids being diverted and that the leading prescription medications that were diverted were opioids, hydrocodone and oxycodone, reasonably support the factfinder's understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in and around Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enforcement. Finally, the	45 14	46	1						
254 1	8 255	3 Relevance- geographic scope; foundation; incomplete answer	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, facts regarding reported trends of pills from Florida being diverted into Huntington and throughout the Appalachian region reasonably support the factfinder's understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in and around Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enforcement. Finally, the witness was capable of answering, as shown by the testimony herein and throughout. The question is not answered incompletely. The examiner asked if there was a time frame for the migration of pills from Florida into Appal	47 15	47	20						

WITNESS DEPOSIT	ON	Brown, Vic 7/8/2020												
			AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS						mpleteness Designation					REPLY DESIGNATIONS * Pink = Completeness Designation
		Objections	Replies to Objections			ge/Li Designation	Objections	Objection	Replies to Objections				Objections	Replies to Objections
ne Begin 255 S	256 2	scope; foundation [Objections applicable to 255:9-255:16]	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, facts regarding reported trends of pills from Florida, Georgia, Tennessee, and "any other jurisdiction where [individuals] could circumvent their own state's prescription monitoring program to obtain prescription medication and thereby bring back and divert those [prescription medications]" into Huntington and throughout the Appalachian region reasonably support the factfinder's understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in and around Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enforcement. Finally, th		in ne E 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	End Notes		Notes		ne Be	<u>ne</u>	End		
257 2	257 18	Relevance- geographic scope; foundation; expert opinion	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, facts regarding reported trends of pills from Florida, Georgia, Tennessee, and "any other jurisdiction where [individuals] could circumvent their own state's prescription monitoring program to obtain prescription medication and thereby bring back and divert those [prescription medications]" into Huntington and throughout the Appalachian region reasonably support the factfinder's understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in and around Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enforcement. Finally, the	59	19 55	9 21								
259 3		scope; foundation [Objections applicable to 260:8-16]	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, facts regarding increases in the resale for abuse and abuse of prescription drugs in an AHIDTA 2000 report funded by the federal Office of National Drug Control Policy articulating actual drug threats in the Appalachia region and that the issue of diversion of prescription drugs was ongoing and getting worse in 2000 reasonably support the factfinder's understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in and around Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the document and the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enforcement. Finally, the witness w	59 :	23 600	0 17								

ITNESS EPOSITION		Brown, Vic 7/8/2020												
EPOSITION		7/8/2020												
//· la /	I.		AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS		. Ia	4.				mpleteness Designation	/		Tar:	REPLY DESIGNATIONS * Pink = Completeness Designation
age/Li Page/l Begin ne End		objections	Replies to Objections		in ne E			Objections	Objection Notes	Replies to Objections		Page/Li ne End	Objections	Replies to Objections
61 4 262	ge se	televance- eographic cope; oundation	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, facts that "patients' sell the controlled substance 'on the streets' for incredible profits, and abuse the substances themselves;" that this was a trend known to be going on in the Appalachia HIDTA Region in 2000 and 2001 as reported in an AHIDTA 2001 report funded by the federal Office of National Drug Control Policy; and that identify the scale of the problem in 2000 and 2001 reasonably support the factfinder's understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in and around Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the document and the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances	66	14 66	 	Conditional on admission of Brown Exhibit 2 - 2000 Annual Report.							
15 263	18		n/a	68	20 69	1	Conditional on admission of Brown Exhibit 2 - 2000 Annual							
10 265	ge se	televance- eographic cope; oundation	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, facts that OxyContin and hydrocodone were the most frequently diverted prescription medications; that prescription drug seizures by Appalachia HIDTA's investigators totaled 105,757 dosage units in 2003; and that, by 2003, AHIDTA had dtermined that diverted prescription medications and opioids most specifically were the most significant drug threat facing residents within the Appalachia HIDTA region, as reported in an AHIDTA 2005 report funded by the federal Office of National Drug Control Policy, reasonably support the factfinder's understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in and around Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the document and the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual	69	4 69	_	Report.							
6 267	ge se	televance- reographic cope; oundation	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, the fact that, "The illicit use of prescription drugs throughout Appalachia HIDTA is perhaps the most underestimated of the drug problem," in 2005, as reported in an AHIDTA 2005 report funded by the federal Office of National Drug Control Policy, reasonably supports the factfinder's understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in and around Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the document and the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, and expertise in the region on its reactions to controlled substances and related regulations and enforcement. Finally, the witness was capable of answering, as shown by the testimony herein and througho		8 70) 16								

WITNESS DEPOSITION		Brown, Vic 7/8/2020											
			AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS			_		_	ppleteness Designation				REPLY DESIGNATIONS * Pink = Completeness Designation
Page/Li Pa ne Begin ne		Objections				Li Designation Notes	Objections	Objection Notes	Replies to Objections		Page/Li ne End	Objections	Replies to Objections
271 11 2:	'2 17 F	Relevance- geographic scope; foundation	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, the facts that AHIDTA asked participating law enforcement agencies to list the drug(s) that contribute most to violent and property crime in their areas and "[o]ver half (52%) of the respondents linked prescription drugs to property crime in their areas," as reported in an AHIDTA 2010 report funded by the federal Office of National Drug Control Policy, and that "the issue of drug addiction and drug consumption affects all aspects of society," reasonably support the factfinder's understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in and around Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Lack of Foundation is not supported. The foundation is provided by the document and the testimony itself. Moreover, the witness is testifying as the AHIDTA Director and corporate representative, with all of AHIDTA's knowledge, and as an individual witness with personal vast knowledge, experience, a	71 <i>4</i>	4 71	12 I		Notes		ne segii	ne cha		
273 5 2:	£ S	Relevance- geographic scope; foundation; expert opinion	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, the facts that there is a connection between people who use prescription medications and some of them going on to use heroin; that the main driving factor in switching to heroin is availability; that users switched over to heroin and fentanyl and other derivatives of synthetic opioids sonce the availability of opioids became less prevalent due to price and availability; that "In [2011, numerous WV law enforcement agencies and some treatment centers reported an increase in heroin abuse due to Rx drug abusers switching to heroin because of heroin's lower cost;" that that one of the trends being observed in the AHIDTA region; and that in 2013, WV HIDTA counties were the center of the threat (particularly the Huntington metropolitan area), as reported in multiple AHIDTA reports funded by the federal Office of National Drug Control Policy, all reasonably support the factfinder's understandin	72 13	3 73	6 Conditional on admission of Brown Exhibit 5 2001 Threat Assessment.							
281 9 21	£	geographic scope; foundation; expert opinion	Lack of Relevance is not supported. It is a low burden to show a fact or opinion has some reasonable connection with, and in regard to evidence in trial, having some value or tendency to prove a matter of fact significant to the case. Specifically, the geographic scope of facts provided by the Appalachia High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas ("AHIDTA" or "Appalachia HIDTA") are materially at issue and provide background, context, and sheer data regarding local opioid issues. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Cabell County is designated as a WV HIDTA County, unequivocally within the geographic Appalachia HIDTA region. Facts regarding drugs in and around Cabell County are reasonably connected to development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Thus, they provide the factfinder with value through their tendency to prove or support understanding of the development of the opioid epidemic in Cabell County and the City of Huntington. Here, the facts that, "[t]he epidemic facing the Appalachian area from the abuse of (controlled) prescription opioid-based narcotics, gave way to the prevailing-and unrelenting-threat from the distribution and abuse of heroin;" that in 2019, AHIDTA reported that "[p]ast [AHIDTA] threat assessments have documented extensively the "see-saw" transitions between availability and subsequent seizures of opiate-based [opiate] [controlled prescription drugs ("CPDs"]) and heroin, driven by cost of each drug throughout the yeas" that in 2019, "[a]s it applies to law enforcement response to [Appalachia HIDTA Drug Threat Survey ("AHDTS")], 71% percent of all respondents document the availability of CPDs to have either increase or remained the same over the last calendar year," and that in 2019, AHIDTA reported that, "In previous years' assessments, a document of the 2019 AHIDTA ("Proport, funded by the f	81 18			Lack of personal knowledge	Asked a personal question, Brown is representing AHIDTA	Testimony is responsive to multiple 30(b)(6) topics (e.g., Topics 3, 4, 5, 6). To the extent testimony falls outside of designated 30(b)(6) topics, it is admissible as provided in Mr. Brown's personal capacity.				

WITNES		Brown, Vic 7/8/2020												
			AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS					R DESIGNATIO	NS * Pink = Com	pleteness Designation				REPLY DESIGNATIONS * Pink = Completeness Designation
		Objections	Replies to Objections	Page/Li	i Page	e/Li	Designation	Objections		Replies to Objections	Page/Li	Page/Li	Objections	Replies to Objections
ne Begin 282 1		3 Calls for a legal conclusion [Objection applicable to 282:13-283:2]	This objection alleging that the inquiry requests the witness to improperly reach a legal conclusion, which is clearly a job reserved for the judge in this bench trial, is unsupported. An inquiry is not objectionable merely because it asks for an opinion or contention that relates to fact or the application of law to fact. The Appalachia HIDTA mission is to enhance and coordinate drug enforcement efforts of local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies within areas designated as High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. Opposite from a legal analysis, these questions request factual clarification of regulations that govern and frame law enforcement action, exactly the kind in which the AHIDTA Director daily engages as directed by the federal Office of National Drug Control Policy.		1 84	16	Notes		Notes		ne Begin	ne End		
-				109	9 109	10	Conditional on							
						:	admission of Brown Exhibit 2 - 2000 Annual Report.							
				109 2	23 111		Conditional on admission of							
				111	6 111	:	Brown Exhibit 2 - 2000 Annual Report. Conditional on							
						:	admission of Brown Exhibit 2 - 2000 Annual Report.							
				111 1	18 112	12	Conditional on admission of Brown Exhibit 28 - 2010 Annual							
				127 1	14 127		Report.	Relavance, lack of personal knowledge, vague	job at AHIDTA	Plaintiffs designated testimony concerning Mr. Brown's knowledge of a purported connection between prescription opioid and heroin abuse (see, e.g., 273:5-280:1). That testimony is inadmissible for the reasons set forth in Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what particular drug someone started with.				
				127 2	22 128	4		Relavance, lack of personal knowledge, vague	job at AHIDTA	Plaintiffs designated testimony concerning Mr. Brown's knowledge of a purported connection between prescription opioid and heroin abuse (see, e.g., 273:5-280:1). That testimony is inadmissible for the reasons set forth in Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what particular drug someone started with.				
				131 2	23 132	. 2			job at AHIDTA	Plaintiffs designated testimony concerning Mr. Brown's knowledge of a purported connection between prescription opioid and heroin abuse (see, e.g., 273:5-280:1). That testimony is inadmissible for the reasons set forth in Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what particular drug someone started with.				
					5 132				job at AHIDTA	Plaintiffs designated testimony concerning Mr. Brown's knowledge of a purported connection between prescription opioid and heroin abuse (see, e.g., 273:5-280:1). That testimony is inadmissible for the reasons set forth in Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what particular drug someone started with.				
+	$\vdash \vdash$	-		133 2 134 2	20 133	23					\vdash	++		
				136										
	•										•	, ,		

March Marc	WITNESS DEPOSITION	Brown, Vic 7/8/2020	3										
Chapter Chap													
1		Objections	Replies to Objections	Page/L	Page/	Li Designation			Replies to Objections	Page/	/Li Page	/Li Objections	Replies to Objections
March Marc	ne Begin ne End	 						Notes		ne Be	gin ne Er	nd	
Down 19 12 12 1 12 1 12 1 12 1 12 1 12 1 12				130	14 136								
1													
10						- 2015 Annual							
1				444	-						_		
All 12 de 2 de 1 de 1 de 1 de 1 de 1 de 1 d				144	2 1/15	16				+			
The state of the s	-	1		145	16 145	23							
10				146	23 147	23							
1 Section 1 Sect				148	8 148	17							
See 1		1											
March Marc		-									-		
The control of the co				159	159	23							
See 3 Co													
Personal Continues of the Continues of t		1								-	_		
Now well, the control of the control				169	16 169								
See 2 De 2													
Control of the Contro									(see, e.g. , 273:5-280:1). That testimony is				
Internal discussion in program to determine decoration in program to describe the control of the													
The state of the s													
Service of the prototy of the protot													
See 10 Se										t			
Internal Monthly American Commission of the process									particular drug someone started with.				
Internal Monthly American Commission of the process													
Internal Monthly American Commission of the process		+		169	20 169	24	Lack of		Plaintiffs designated testimony concerning Mr		+++		
browledge, value of the control of t				103	103								
inadmissible for the reasons of tred in its interference depletes. In the center of the control									between prescription opioid and heroin abuse				
Defendent subjections in the centre of a manifest of the current of a manifest of the current of a manifest of the current of the current of a manifest of the current of t							vague						
Season of the counter of degree for the property of the proper													
provide the encessary constraint after Proposed to done not know, your AV WOLD About not know, what put that the proposed to do the proposed to the proposed t													
lank of process state of the control source, and Artifold's document state, what permitted the generate state of the control source													
Such of planets and provided connection between precision constraints of planets and provided connections are precision provided to the contract department of planets and provided connections are precision to provide the provided connection are precision of planets and provided connections are precision to provide the provided connection are precisions are precisions are precisions are precisions and provided connections are precisions are precisions are precisions and provided connections are precisions and provided connections are precisions and provided connections are precisions are precisions and provided connections are precisions a									does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what	t			
December of the control of the contr									particular drug someone started with.				
December of the control of the contr													
personal knowledge, but where preceptions ablabate (ser. e.g., 273-2011). That testimony is sometiment of the counter designation in poper to approach and precise ablabate (ser. e.g., 273-2011). That testimony is sometiment of the counter designation in poper to approach the necessary protect that Mr. Bloom does not sow, and ANDTOX does not track, what personal but when the counter designation is proper to approach the counter designation in poper to approach the precision total with the counter designation of track, what personal knowledge, where propagations to the will be approached connection between programment of the precision of the prec	- 	1		170	2 170	3	Lack of		Plaintiffs designated testimony concerning Mr.				
vague lice, e.g., 273-2801. That testimony is inabmissible for the reasons set forth in Delevidant's Objections. To the extent it is admirted, the counter designation approars to admire the counter designation approars of a proper to admire the counter designation and track, what darkfullar does not from, and admired, the counter designation are started with. 170 170 10 Lack of previous counter designation are started with workedge, vague of the counter designation of the reasons set forth in Delevidant's objections. To the extent it is admirted, the counter designation is proper to provide the necessary contract that Nr. Brown does not know, and AMIDTA does not track, what particular drug someones started with. 170 12 170 15 Lack of previous and AMIDTA does not track, what particular drug someones started with a process of started with a process of started with a particular drug someones started with a started with a process of started with a particular drug someones started with a process of started with a process of started with a particular drug someones started with a process of started with a process of started with a process of started with a particular drug someones started with a process of started with a started with a process of started with a process of started with a													
insubmissible for the reasons set forth in Disfinding this operation. To the entered is a solution, this counter designation is people to a solution, this counter designation is people to do so not track, what particular drug someones started with. 270 2 320 10 Section 1 Sec													
Defendants' Objections. To the extent it is admitted, this counter degree for a provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown of the service o							vague						
admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context shift will, frown does not know, and AlariDA does n													
provide the necessary content that Mr. Brown does not know, and ARUTAT does not track, what particular drug someone started with. 170 7 170 10 Lack of personal knowledge, vagee and some started with a subject of the second started with subj													
articular drug someone started with. 170 7 170 10 Lack of personal strowledge of a purported connection between prescription good and herical abuse (ACC, ACC, ACC) and the content is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary concerning Mr. Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary concerning Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDIA does not track, what particular drug someone started with. 170 12 170 15 Lack of personal someone started with. 170 18 170 19 Lack of personal someone started with. 170 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18									provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown				
170 7 170 10 Lack of personal knowledge, vague The personal knowledge, vague 170 12 170 15 Lack of personal knowledge, vague 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 170										t			
personal knowledge, vague Paintiffs designated testimony connection Paintiffs designated testimony connec									particular drug someone started with.				
personal knowledge, vague Paintiffs designated testimony connection Paintiffs designated testimony connec													
personal knowledge, vague Part		<u>† </u>		170	7 170	10	Lack of		Plaintiffs designated testimony concerning Mr.				
vague (see, e.g., 273-5-2801.) That testimony is hadmissible for the reasons set forth in Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what particular drug someone started with. 170 12 170 15 Lack of personal knowledge of a purported connection between prescription project and have prescription project and heroin abuse (see, e.g., 2735-2801.) That testimony is inadmissible for the reasons set forth in Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted, this counter designated testimony for the reasons set forth in Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA.							personal		Brown's knowledge of a purported connection				
landmissible for the reasons set forth in Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and Alth The does not know, and the particular drug someone started with. 170 12 170 15 Lack of personal Brown's knowledge of a purported connection between prescription opioid and heroin abuse (see, e.g., e.g., a.g., a													
Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted, this proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what particular drug someon stard with. 170 12 170 15 Lack of personal knowledge, vague 170 12 170 15 Lack of personal knowledge, of a purported connection between prescription opioid and heroin abuse (see, e.g., 273-282-801.) That testimony is nadmissible for the reasons set forth in Defendant, it is admitted. To the extent it is admitted. To the extent it is admitted. To the extent it is admitted. The provides the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not knowled despressors on track, what							vague						
admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what particular drug someone started with. 170 12 170 15 Lack of personal Brown's knowledge of a purported connection between prescription opioid and heroin abuse (see, e.g., 273-5-280-1). That testimony is inadmissible for the reasons set forth in Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what													
provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what particular drug someone started with. 170 12 170 15 Lack of personal Brown's knowledge of a purported connection between prescription opioid and heroin abuse (see, e.g., 273:5-280:1). That testimony is inadmitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what													
particular drug someone started with. 170 12 170 15 Lack of personal knowledge, vague Plaintiffs designated testimony concerning Mr. Brown's knowledge of a purported connection between prescription opioid and heroin abuse (see, e.g., 273:5-280:1). That testimony is inaminist of pite craos not in Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the know, and AlhIDTA does not track, what									provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown				
170 12 170 15 Lack of personal knowledge, between prescription opioid and heroin abuse (see, e.g., 273:5-280:1). That is admitted, this counter designation to provide that for provide does not know, and AHIDTA does not know, and AHIDTA does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what													
personal knowledge, between prescription opioid and heroin abuse (see, e.g., 273:5-280:1). That testimony is inadmissible for the reasons set in the Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what									particular drug someone started with.				
personal knowledge, between prescription opioid and heroin abuse (see, e.g., 273:5-280:1). That testimony is inadmistrations. To the extent it is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what													
knowledge, vague (see, e.g., 273:5-280:1). That testimony is inadmissible for the reasons set of the reason				170	170	15	Lack of						
vague (see, e.g., , 273:5-280:1). That testimony is inadmissible reasons set forth in Defendance extent it is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what													
inadmissible for the reasons set forth in Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted to proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what													
Defendants' objections. To the extent it is admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what							vague						
admitted, this counter designation is proper to provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what													
provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what									admitted, this counter designation is proper to				
									provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown				
particulal drug someone started with.													
									particular drug someone started with.				
						·							

WITNE		Brown, Vic 7/8/2020												
			AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS							oleteness Designation				REPLY DESIGNATIONS * Pink = Completeness Designation
	i Page/Li	Objections	Replies to Objections	Page/	Li Page	e/Li L	Designation			Replies to Objections	Page/Li	Page/Li	Objections	Replies to Objections
ne Beg	in ne End				gin ne E 21 172			Relevance		Testimony concerning funding by others (e.g., AHIDTA) to address opioid-related harms in the City of Huntington and Cabell County is relevant to disputed issues in this case.	ne Begii	n ne End		
-				193	2 193	3 13							†	
						L 18 (Conditional on : admission of Brown Exhibit 47 - 2019 Threat Assessment.		scope of testimony on direct	By Plaintiffs' admission, testimony concerning the "the drug crisis in the Appalachian region" is both relevant and in-scope. See Pls.' Objection Note to 34:13-35:21. To the extent testimony falls outside of designated 30(b)(6) topics, it is admissible as provided in Mr. Brown's personal capacity. See, e.g., Falchenberg v. New York State Dep't of Educ., 642 F. Supp. 2d 156, 164 (S.D.N.Y. 2008), off'd, 338 F. App'x 11 (2d Cir. 2009) ("Questions and answers exceeding the scope of the 30(b)(6) notice will not bind the corporation, but are merely treated as the answers of the individual deponent.").				
				212	7 212	ē	Conditional on admission of Brown Exhibit 47 - 2019 Threat Assessment.		scope of testimony on direct	By Plaintiffs' admission, testimony concerning the "the drug crisis in the Appalachian region" is both relevant and in-scope. See Pls.' Objection Note to 34:13-35:21. To the extent testimony falls outside of designated 30(b)(6) topics, it is admissible as provided in Mr. Brown's personal capacity. See, e.g., Falchenberg v. New York State Dep't of Educ., 642 F. Supp. 2d 156, 164 (S.D.N.Y. 2008), off'd, 338 F. App'x 11 (2d Cir. 2009) ("Questions and answers exceeding the scope of the 30(b)(6) notice will not bind the corporation, but are merely treated as the answers of the individual deponent.").				
				235	2 235	6 E	Conditional on admission of Brown Exhibit 18 - 2006 Annual Report.							
						7 12 (a E	Conditional on admission of Brown Exhibit 18 - 2006 Annual Report.	Form		Form objection not preserved by contemporanous objection; Plaintiffs do not identify with particularity the form that they allege is objectionable.				
						6 - F	Conditional on admission of Brown Exhibit 18 - 2006 Annual Report.							
					10 239			Form		Form objection not preserved by contemporanous objection; Plaintiffs do not identify with particularity the form that they allege is objectionable.				
				239	19 239	19		Form		Plaintiffs do not identify with particularity the form that they allege is objectionable.				
					4 255									
-	+				10 262 3 266						-	++	-	
	<u> </u>			266	15 266	5 24								
1				267	2 267	7 5								
				285		5 19 (6 1 1 1	Conditional on admission of Brown Exhibit 2 - 2000 Annual Report.							
				∠86	9 288	2 F E	Conditional on admission of Brown Exhibit 2 - 2000 Annual Report and Brown Exhibit 5 - 2001 Threat Assessment							

WITNESS		Brown, Vic													
DEPOSITION		7/8/2020													
			AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS							pleteness Designation					REPLY DESIGNATIONS * Pink = Completeness Designation
Page/Li Pa		bjections	Replies to Objections	Page/	Li Page	e/Li Design	ation (Objection	Replies to Objections	Page/L	i Page	/Li Obje	ctions	Replies to Objections
ne Begin ne	End					nd Notes 19 Condit	onal on		Notes		ne Begi	in ne Er	nd		
				200	13 200	admiss									
							Exhibit 28								
						- 2010									
	+			288	23 290	Report 6 Condit						-	-		
				200	25 250	admiss									
							Exhibit 28								
							Annual								
++	++			292	3 292	Report 9 Condit					\vdash	+	+		
						admiss									
							Exhibit 47								
						- 2019 Assess									
++	+ +			292	24 293	20 Condit						+			
						admiss	ion of								
							Exhibit 47								
						- 2019 Assess									
	1 1			298	13 298			Lack of		Mr. Brown's knowledge of diversion, or lack					
							ţ	personal		thereof, is directly relevant to multiple topics					
								knowledge,		affirmatively designated by Plaintiffs.					
	1 1			298	18 299	12		vague Lack of		Mr. Brown's knowledge of diversion, or lack					
				230	10 255			personal		thereof, is directly relevant to multiple topics					
								knowledge,		affirmatively designated by Plaintiffs.					
-++				200	18 300	-		vague Lack of		Plaintiffs designated testimony concerning Mr.		-			
				299	16 300	3		personal		Brown's knowledge of a purported connection					
								knowledge,		between prescription opioid and heroin abuse					
								vague,		(see, e.g., 273:5-280:1). That testimony is					
								outside scope of direct		inadmissible for the reasons set forth in Defendants' objections. To the extent it is					
								oi un ect		admitted, this counter designation is proper to					
										provide the necessary context that Mr. Brown					
										does not know, and AHIDTA does not track, what					
++	+			300	17 300	24	ı	Form		particular drug someone started with. Form objection not preserved by	\vdash	+	-		
				330	_, 500		ľ			contemporanous objection; Plaintiffs do not					
										identify with particularity the form that they					
+	++			201	2 201			l ask of		allege is objectionable.	\vdash	+			
				301	3 301	4									
								knowledge,							
							\	vague,							
								oi uirect							
				301	3 301	4	! !								